REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the non-final Office Action mailed on June 8, 2010. Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14-19 are pending, of which Claims 1 and 8 are in independent form. By the present amendment, Claims 1 and 8 have been amended. Claims 6 and 13 have been previously cancelled. No new matter or issues are believed to be introduced by the amendments.

Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0079225 to Peising et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0034875 to Bulkowski et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2009/0320073 to Reisman. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1, as amended herein, recites, *inter alia*, as follows:

"...pausing the received timebase, at unspecified time intervals, **to accommodate at least interactive applications,** if the identification signal is not present..." (Emphasis added.)

The applied combination of Peising, Bulkowski, and Reisman fails to disclose and/or suggest at least "...pausing the received timebase, at unspecified time intervals, to accommodate at least interactive applications, if the identification signal is not present," as recited in amended independent Claim 1.

At page 5 of the present Office Action, the Examiner stated that Peising and Bulkowski fail to mention "pausing timebase at unspecified time intervals." The Examiner relied on Reisman to cure such deficiencies. However, Peising, Bulkowski, and Reisman do not teach and/or suggest the additional feature(s) of independent Claim 1.

As understood by Applicant, Reisman relates to systems and methods for navigating hypermedia using multiple coordinated input/output device sets. Disclosed systems and methods allow a user and/or an author to control what resources are presented on which device sets (whether they are integrated or not), and provide for coordinating browsing activities to enable such a user interface to be employed across multiple independent systems. (Abstract)

Specifically, as noted by the Examiner, Reisman states, at paragraph [0206]:

> "Such codings may also indicate whether the real-time start is in reference to some external broadcast or other event, in which case it might revert to non-real-time at the end of that broadcast interval, or in relative time reference to some other stream, in which case that relative reference might remain in effect. Thus tuning to the Olympics the next morning might start it at the beginning of the previous night's program, but any internal relative references might play in synch with the reference (such as alternative camera angles synchronized to the main program)."

Therefore, the user may be able to control what resources are presented and how they are presented, however, the user may not interact with the programs presented.

In contrast, as claimed in amended independent Claim 1, the pauses occur at unspecified time periods, but may occur for interactive programs. For example, paragraphs [0031] and [0032] of Applicant's published application (2008/0222672) refers to a quiz show, where TV viewers may actively participate, in real-time, with the quiz show. TV viewers may answer questions, in real-time, as they are presented to the contestants of the quiz show. Thus, the present disclosure, as well as the Claims as amended, support or accommodate real-time interactive applications, without interrupting the broadcasting of signals.

Thus, the applied combination of Peising, Bulkowski, and Reisman clearly does not teach and/or suggest the feature(s) added to amended independent Claim 1.

Independent Claim 8 includes the same or similar limitations to those of Claim 1, and is allowable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons presented above for the patentablity of independent Claim 1.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) with respect to Claims 1 and 8 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5, 7, 9-12, and 14-19 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claims 1 and 8 and contain all of the features of Claims 1 and 8. Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above for the patentability of Claims 1 and 8, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-5, 7, 9-12, and 14-19 are also patentable over Peising and Bulkowski, taken alone or in any proper combination. Additionally, dependent Claims 2-5, 7, 9-12, and 14-19 contain further patentable elements/features. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 2-5, 7, 9-12, and 14-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and allowance of said claims are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14-19, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin C. Ecker, Esq.
Registration No. 43,600

Date: October 8, 2010   By: George Likourezos
                                                     Reg. No. 40,067
                                                     Attorney for Applicant
                                                     631-501-5706

Mail all correspondence to:
Kevin C. Ecker, Esq.
Senior IP Counsel
Philips Electronics North America Corp.
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9618